## Application No. Applicant(s) 10/670.049 KRUPENKINE, THOMAS Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary NIKITA Evaminer Art I Init David N. Spector 2873 All Participants: Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_ (1) David N. Spector (USPTO examiner). (3) \_\_\_\_\_. (4) (2) John McCabe (applicant's representative) . Date of Interview: 8 March 2011 Time: 2pm Type of Interview: □ Telephonic Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative) ΠNo If Yes, provide a brief description: Part I. Rejection(s) discussed: Claims discussed: N/A Prior art documents discussed: N/A Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet Part III. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. X It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/David N. Spector/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2873

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature - if appropriate)

Continuation Sheet (PTO-413B) PTOL-413B (04-03)

Examiner Initiated Interview Summary

Application No. Paper No. 20110309

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The instant inventor "Thomas Nikita Krupenkine" (e.g., the name of the inventor on the oath/disclosure filled papicant on 10 January 2005) is identified as "Timofel Nikita Krupenkine" on a number of other patents. The examiner contacted applicant's representative to determine: 1) if "Thomas Nikita Krupenkine" is the same individual as Timofel Nikita Krupenkine" and "Timofel Nikita Krupenkine" as ame individual and that "Timomas Nikita Krupenkine" was a American-ized version son to completely certain, however if the full name of the inventor has been legally changed "Thomas Nikita Krupenkine". It was agreed that applicant's representitive would determine which name needs to appear on the oath/declaration for the instant applicant's representitive would determine which name needs to appear on the oath/declaration for the instant applicant is represented the season of the properties of the stant applicant's represented the season of the season o